

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-41 are all the claims pending in the Application, as claims 39-41 are hereby added, and as claim 9 is hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Only claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 26 stand rejected. Claim 38 stands withdrawn from consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating, in the *Office Action Summary*, that claims 27-37 are allowed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating, in the *Office Action Summary*, that claims 7 and 9-15 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.¹ Applicants hereby add the features of allowable claim 9 in independent claim 1, and cancel claim 9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is now allowable, along with all of the claims 3-8 and 10-26 that depend therefrom.

Drawings

The Examiner has again objected to the Drawings, repeating, *verbatim*, his previous allegation that “[t]he first lock mechanism ‘**connecting** said first terminals and said second terminals’ must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)” (*O.A.*, pp. 2, 3, **emphasis** in original, citing 37 C.F.R. § 1.83).

¹ Applicants note that numbered paragraph 10 of the *Office Action*, which is included to indicate “allowable subject matter,” indicates only that “claims 2, 10, 13-16 and 20-25” would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. To the extent that this indication differs from the *Office Action Summary*, Applicants believe this indication to include typographical errors which are the result of this paragraph not being changed from the March 1, 2005 *Office Action*.

In the August 4, 2005 *Amendment*, Applicants submitted new Figures 7a and 8a, which show the features in question, and requested withdrawal of this objection. However, in the instant *Office Action*, the Examiner alleges that “the new figures provided by the applicant don’t really show anything. The core of the applicant’s invention seems to be a locking mechanism that not only locks the board in place but also makes electrical contact between the first and second terminal” (*O.A.*, p. 2).

Applicants disagree. First, Applicants respectfully submit that the “core” of their invention is defined by the claims in their entirety, not by a portion thereof.

Second, 37 C.F.R. § 1.83 simply specifies that “[t]he drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.” Applicants have complied with this requirement, as Figures 7a and 8a show: (1) an edge portion 69 of electronic circuit package 61 at a fully inserted position where terminals 65 of electronic circuit package 61 are connected to terminals 63 of connector 62 (the terminals 63, 65 are shown in detail in Figures 7 and 8); and (2) a lock mechanism, exemplified by opening and closing mechanism 64.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner alleges that claims 1 and 3-37 are directed to an invention (“Invention I”) different from claim 38 (“Invention II”), and therefore requires that Applicants formally elect one of the Inventions for further prosecution (Applicants earlier provisionally elected Invention I in response to a telephone call from the Examiner).

Applicants disagree that restriction is proper in this case, as MPEP § 803 indicates that, “if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the

examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions” (emphasis added).

In this instance, the features recited in independent claim 38, including the housing, fan, connectors, and cooling airflow direction, were already recited in various ones of the original claims 1, 4, 5 and 7. Thus, the Examiner has necessarily already performed a search for these features, and cannot argue that there is an additional burden placed upon him. See also MPEP § 810.01.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this Restriction Requirement.

To comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.143, Applicants confirm their earlier provisional election of Invention I, claims 1 and 3-37 (and new claims 39-41).

Obviousness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bunnel* (US 4,587,596; hereinafter “*Bunnel*”) in view of *Wilson* (US 2003/0063454 A1; hereinafter “*Wilson*”).

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in view of the addition of the features of allowable dependent claim 9 into independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that rejected dependent claims 3-6, 8 and 26 are allowable, *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 39-41 are hereby added. Claims 39 and 40 recite the "lock mechanism" of independent claim 1, but are dependent from allowed claims 32 and 35. Claim 41 corresponds to allowable claim 7 rewritten in independent form.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-8 and 10-41 are allowable. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the application now is in condition for allowance with all of the claims 1, 3-8 and 10-41.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, except for the Issue Fee, to our Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy P. Cremen
Registration No. 50,855

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 13, 2006